Chapter XI.

Administration.

Inscriptions of the reigns of the Candella rulers do not furnish a systematic and consistent account of their administrative organisation. It is clear however that their government, as in other contemporary states, was wholly of the prevailing monarchical type. The Candella King was the pivot of the administrative structure, without whom the state had no existence. He must have enjoyed an authority, which presumably was not subject to any constitutional check exercised by a popular assembly or any other such institution, to which no reference has been made in their extant records. Theoretically the constituents of the state, were the 'Sapta Prakrtis', as conceived by the political thinkers of ancient India. The Mân Inscription alludes to 'āṛgāṇi sapta' *(the seven constituent parts of the state structure)*, leaving the expression undefined. By this must have been meant, the king (svāmi), the ministers (amāṭya), the realm (janapada), the capital (dūrga), the treasury (kośa), the army (bala), and the ally (mitra). Thus the other 'limbs' besides the king were functioning in the Candella state. As known from the inscriptive sources there were ministers in the Candella kingdom, representing the limb known as 'amāṭya'. Military power (bala), without which the Candellas
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could not have expanded their territory, must have also functioned as an effective limb. That the treasury, i.e., the kośa, constituted another essential element of the state, is shown in the use of the expression 'kośādhikārādhipati'.

The King. - The Candella kings generally assumed the usual imperial titles in their official documents, viz., Paramēśvara, Paramabhattāraka, Mahārājadhirāja &c. But it is of interest to note that the early rulers of the family up to Yaśovarman are mentioned in the records simply as, rājan, nrpa, mahipati, ksitipa, nrpakulilakash, ksitidhararilakash &c. The usual imperial designations were used by their successors from the time of Dhanagha, who succeeded Yaśovarman. Yaśovarman, it may be mentioned, was the real architect of the greatness of the Candellas, but as he retained at least a show of allegiance to the Imperial Pratiharas, he did not assume any mark of formal independence. The conquest of Kālānjār by Yaśovarman was an important incident in the history of the Candellas, and this was signified by the assumption of the epithet of 'Kālānjārajādhipati' by his successors. Another title, Parama-Māheśvara,
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frequently adopted by the Candelles in some of their records symbolises their devotion to the Śaiva cult.

The influence of the Kalacuris, whom the Candella rulers defeated, is noticed in the adoption of the Gaja-Lakṣmī emblem on the latter's seals and coins. To the same influence was due the assumption of the well-known Kalacuri titles by some of Candella rulers, viz., "Parama-mahēśvara Śrīmad Vāmadevapādānāḥyāta", and "Trikaliṅgadhīpiṇa nijabhujopārjita-nāvapati-gajapati-nārapati rājatrayādhipati", prefixed to the name of Candella Trailokyavaranman in the Rṣā copper plate of Kūmarapala. The Bhureti copper plate issued shortly after the conquest of Rṣā area by Trailokyavaranman also reveals that, besides the Kalacuri titles, some titles of the Gahadavāla rulers viz., Paramabhattīraketyādi-samasta rājavāla-virājamaṇa ("The king endowed with all the royal titles, commencing with Paramabhattaraka"), "vividha-vidyā-vicāra-vācaspati" (expert like a Vācaspati or Brhaspati in the pursuit of different sciences) and Kanyakubjadhipati (lord of Kanyakubja), were used with the name of the Candella king. Some of the titles are specially significant. The description of the king as "vividhavidyā vicāra vācaspati" proves that he must have been acquainted with the sciences studied in his time which led to the sharpening of his intellect and development of his power of judgment. A Sati record of the time of Hammiravarman (A.D. 1308) and the Chārkharī Copper Plate of Hammiravarman (1346 V.S.) also use the title 'rājā-valitrayopeta' for the ruler, evidently implying 'āsvapati',

11. ibid., XX., P. 2.
12. ibid., XVI., P. 10., f.n. 4.
13. ibid., XX., P. 134-35.
'gajapati,' and 'narapati.' In L. 12 of the Dhureti Copper Plate Trailokyavaman is given the epithet, Triśatirājyādhipati (the lord of the kingdom consisting of three hundred), which is not met with elsewhere.

None of these records excepting the Čhārkhāri Plate of V.S. 1346 is an official document of the Candeśa rulers. Hence it may be doubted if all the titles mentioned above were officially assumed by them. It may be noted that these titles occur particularly in the records connected with those areas which had been under the Kalacuri or Gahadavala rule. Another interesting title used by Candeśa Hammiravarman himself and also attached to the members of his predecessors in the Čhārkhāri plate of V.S. 1346 is 'Sahi,' probably indicative of the growing Muslim influence in the courts of northern and central India.

Succession. - The Candeśa monarchy was normally hereditary, the son succeeding the father on the throne. Even if the son was a minor, it was customary to install him on the throne. The legendary Parnal Rāso gives instance while referring to the case of Parmardī, who was only a boy of five when called upon to succeed his father. Early accession to the throne by Parmardī is proved by epigraphic testimony, where he is described as "bālopi netā." It was necessary to make some sort of arrangement for the actual administration of the territory if such a situation arose but we have no information about that.
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The Gandella records do not contain any hint of rivalry for the throne in the royal family. If the reigning king died without leaving any male issue, the throne passed without any trouble to the younger brother of the deceased ruler. The history of the Candellas furnishes two cases of peaceful succession by collateral lines. Jayasakti, one of the early rulers, having no direct heir, was succeeded by his younger brother, Vijayasakti. It is noteworthy that both the names are mentioned in the records of the latter's successors. Kirtivarmans also came to the throne after the death of Jayavarman, his elder brother. Another interesting case is that of Prthvivarmans, who ascended the throne after the death of his nephew, Jayavarman. There is no evidence to show that these were cases of disputed succession. Rai Bahadur Hiralal suggests that Hammiravarman was a younger brother of Bhojavarman on the evidence of non-assumption of the royal title 'Maharajadhiraj' by the former in the Chârkâri Plate of 1346 V.S., as Bhojavarmas was the ruling sovereign then, as known from the Ajaygadh Rock Insc. of the same year. In that case this was also a case of undisputed succession by a younger brother, though the relationship is difficult to be proved.
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Khajurāho record of V.S. 1059 and a Kālaṇjar record refer to voluntary abdication of the throne by Dhaṅga and Jayavarman respectively. Dhaṅga, who had lived up to one hundred years, may have abdicated on the ground of infirmity due to old age. Jayavarman retired because, as he himself declared, he felt wearied of government.

The oldest son of the reigning king was regarded as his heir apparent. While the younger sons were often appointed to responsible posts. The Dudāhi stone inscription refers to Devalabdi, and his father, Kṛṣṇapa, a son of Yasovarman, which suggests that his family had a special position in this region. Dudāhi visaya was an outlying district of the Gandella kingdom, and it acquired a political importance due to its common frontier with the Paramāras. Pratāpa, the younger brother (bhrātā kaniyān) of king Madanavarman is described in a Kālaṇjar inscription as a very influential person in the court, and he undertook diverse works of public interest, including erection of temples, construction of tanks and gardens and providing care for the sick and indigent subjects.

There is reference to the ritual of coronation ceremony (mūrdhābhīṣikta) which a new king had to pass through on his accession to the throne. Details are not indicated in any of the records. But the signs of royalty as referred to in

different inscriptions are, simhāsana (throne), pādāpītha (foot stool), atapātra (royal umbrella), mauli (head garland or the crown), &c. These indicate that the usual splendour and majesty were associated with the royal office of the Candellas. There are references also to the royal retinue and the royal palace.

Personal qualities. - An idea about the requisite qualities of a king can be formed from the eulogistic references to the Candella monarchs in their inscriptions. As described in these records they were of handsome appearance (kandarpakaṇṭārthāḥ, saurūpāngāḥ), of impressive personality (paurusā), learning (vidyāvadātākyāya - 3.1., P. 141, V.17), proficiency in arts and poetic talents (kāvyaśākhyārdo-lakṣaṇa-guṇagānādhiṣṭāmā), virtuous and of pleasing conduct ('subhacarita pavitram', 'śadvṛttasya ca sadma'), devoted to Dharma ("Dharma-vatsalāh" "Dharmādharah" "Dharmikah" "Dharmmamakohisakah") &c. Their ability to protect the state
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against internal and external enemies in the same way as a 'kulavadhū' is protected and their ability to eradicate social evils (kantakaśodhana) as well as their tolerant attitude and policy to different forms of religion are also referred to. Their munificence is often highly spoken of and they are described as the veritable 'kalpataru', the tree that fulfills all desires.  

Not only in the Gandella inscriptions but everywhere when a king is praised, either in epigraphic or literary records, these qualities are attributed to him. It may however be pointed out that the Gandella praśastikāras considered such qualities to be essential for a king. In view of the duties which the kings had to perform, these qualities were required for efficient administration and pursuit of a successful policy at home and abroad. They were well in accord with the practical requirements of statesmanship and administration.

Divine comparisons. - Kings of the Gandella family, as was customary in those days, have been compared to some of the deities of the Brahmanical pantheon or legendary heroes. The family claims to have originated from the Moon-God, and mythological sages, like Marici, Atri, &c., of the Candraśāṃsā. Moreover later rulers like Kīrtivarman and Trailokyavarman are often compared to Viṣṇu. In the Deogadh Rock inscription Kīrtivarman is likened to Viṣṇu without his usual weapon,
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'gada' (agadam nūtanam Viṣṇum ...?) and in the Mahobā inscrip-
tion to Puruṣottama (Viṣnu). Trailokyavarman is described
as 'Turuskakulyambhimagnadhātri-sāmuddhṛtīm Viṣṇuriva
pratanaṃ' (Just as Viṣṇu, who lifted up the earth in his
Varāha incarnation, so Trailokyavarman revived the Gandella
power, submerged in the ocean formed by the streams of the
Turuska invaders). It is also claimed for Kirtivarman in the
Deogadh record that 'surely Yudhisthira, Sadāśiva and
Rāmacandra (all) entered his body'. Brahma, Dharma, Indra,
Kāla, Kubera are some of the other deities with whom the
Gandella kings are often placed on equal footing. They are
also compared to Yudhisthira, Bhima, Arjuna, Karṇa and Rāma
as well as to Brhaspati and Śukra. Thus though absolute
divinity is not directly claimed, equation with divinities
and legendary characters of great celebrity served the
purpose of glorifying the sanctity of the hereditary monarchy
of the Gandellas. The prāśastikārās it may be noted, took up
the ideas contained in the Mānava Dharma śāstra and other
such texts regarding the divinity of the king.

Duties and Functions. - The supreme position in the state
belonged to the king. Final authority in regard to the
military and administrative functions of the state rested with
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Epigraphic evidences bear ample testimony to the different Candella rulers' personally directing military campaigns. It is well-known that the Candella power was founded on territorial conquests. Quite naturally therefore the Candella records give the utmost importance to the part played by the kings personally in military matters. Some of the Candella kings are definitely mentioned to have led their armies in person. Kings themselves were responsible for the formulation of their policies of peace and war. Ministers and military leaders, of course, helped the king in such matters, but, as the Parnāl Rāṣe shows, Paramardi once disregarded the expert opinion of high military officials and launched a battle with Prthvīrāj Cauhān.

King's concern in affording protection to the people against internal and external dangers is best evident from the description of the state as 'kulavadhū' (kulavadhūṁiva vasundhārāṁ nirākulāṁ paripālayāṇavikāla viveka nirūmali-kṛtmati ...). This conception is evidently based on the idea that a state is like a wife depending entirely on the husband for the protection of her person and honour. As it is the sacred duty of the husband to protect her, so also is the duty of the king to protect his subjects, who are helpless like a wife and should be defended by the king.
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Spithests like 'para-rakṣā bhūtaśvapi' (carefully protecting all beings) - Māu Insc. V. 13, 'trasta-trāma-pragūpamanaśā' (Khajurāho Insc. II. V. 9), 'trasta-trātāri' (Khajurāho Insc., V. 25, protecting the distressed), 'āpāsyā prajāmā bhayam' (removing the fear of the subjects, Māu Insc. V. 39), 'hrīdī prajāmāttānaśaśānti' (weapon to destroy fear from the hearts of the subjects, Khajurāho Insc., IV., V. 17), &c., indicate that the Candella rulers were particularly careful in the matter of maintenance of the security of their kingdom. The period was full of troubles and dangers. There were not only external dangers but evil forces were also at work within the Candella territory. The people were afraid of dire calamities threatening them from all sides. A striking emphasis is therefore placed on the king’s power to remove terror from their minds.

There are numerous references in the Candella records to the 'weeding out of thorns' ('kṛtya kaṅṭaka śodhanaṁ janapade' - Māu Record., V. 39, 'ucchinnah kaṅṭakauṣa' - Māu Record., V. 6, 'durādhah kṛta kaṅṭakasya' - Batesvar Insc., V. 24, 'śphitam rājyaṁ akeṇṭakām' - Rock Insc. of Bhojavarmān, V. 20, 'kaṇḍita nikhila dūṣṭah' - Māu Record., V. 6, and 'dūṣṭaprahantā' - Rock Insc. of Vīravarman., V.9), i.e., extermination of the wicked and subversive elements from the kingdom. These references show that the Candella rulers were alert and watchful, and they took stern steps to exterminate all elements of disorder. The king was regarded not only as the supreme administrative head but also he claimed to be the guardian of the traditional social order. The Māu stone inscription describes Sallaksana as one encouraging and even forcing people of various castes
to remain true to their traditional duties. Like all others the king also was subject to Dharma. He was afraid of the consequences resulting from the violation of the sacred law (bhîrûrdharmâparâdho) on his own part. Dharma which must mean the laws and injunctions embodied in the Śâstras, was the only guide of the king (dharmaṅgekaśakā) in the performance of his duties in his personal as well as in his public life.

The religious activities of the Candella kings were attested by their erection of temples and installation of Śâivite and Vaiṣṇavite as well as Jain images. Their interest was apparently not confined to Hindu religion, they were broad-minded enough to extend their patronage to Jainism and Buddhism also.

Kings are described as 'janânandasundarāḥ' 'sajjanSnanda- jananah', i.e., one who pleases the people. The use of these epithets indicate the value which the Candella rulers attached to obtaining popularity amongst their subjects.
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Writers of legal texts prescribed royal tours of inspection as a measure to check administrative corruptions and guard against the oppressive officials. The duty, as enjoined by them, was sought to be carried out by the Candella rulers. Their charters were issued when they were on tours in the different parts of their dominions. Bhingadeva, when at Kāśīkā (Benares), gave the village Yullī situated in Usaravāha to Bhatṭa Yaśodhara in V.S. 1055 (998 A.D.). Devavarman, when at Suwałī samāvāsa encampment, gave the village Kathahau in the Rājapura avastha to Brahmin Abhimanyu. Madanavarman, when in residence near Bhailasvāmin (modern Bhilsā) gave ten ploughs of land of the village of Bambharaḍā in the Sudāli visaya to Brahmin Rāhulaśarman. Paramardi when in the camp of Sonasāra confirmed a long list of land grants made by his grand-father, Madanavarman during the latter’s encampment at Vāridurga. A number of records were issued by Paramardi from Vilasapurā, which is not definitely identifiable.

The Candella records are completely silent about the judicial functions of the king. It is quite probable that the usual functions of the Indian king in the period were also performed by the Candella kings.

An important function of the king was the selection and appointment of his ministers and the important officials after due 'tests' ("parikṣya saṃyak"), which remind us of the
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'upadhaś' prescribed in the Arthaśāstra of Kaṇṭilāya(1,115-116).

Inscriptional sources give little information about the personal life of the king. These sources occasionally to Kriśñagiri (pleasure mount) and Kalisarasi (swimming pools). Details about the royal sports are not available, but evidently they were on such occasions gaily attired and accompanied by an equally gay retinue, which included particularly youthful damsels. The pleasure mount of Vākpati on the Vindhya mountain once resounded with the sweet notes of his 'excellencies' sung by Kirtāta women, seated on spotless lotuses, and on which groups of peacocks were made to dance by the bubbling noise of water-falls rushing down from its tops (Khajurāho Insc., II., V. 13). Amorous dalliances of the king within the harem are also mentioned in the Nāṁyura Plate of Dhaṅga (V.S. 1065).

The Candella king attended dramatic performances. The drama Prabodhācandrodāya was staged in the presence of Kirtivarman, who evinced great interest in it. 56

Ministers. - The Candella kings had their ministers to advise them on matters of policy and also to help them in executing their projects. Some of their ministers claim to have served the royal family on an hereditary basis. The Māu stone inscription refers to a family of ministers serving the Candellas from the time of Dhaṅga to that of Madanavarman. 57 Similarly the Baṭāśāvar inscription refers to Lāhaḍa, who was the Chief minister of Madanavarman, while his son, Sallakṣaṇa,
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and grandson, Purusottama, held the same position under Paramardideva. Birth was not always the sole criterion in the selection of ministers. Learning, experience, power of judgment and capacity for leadership were some of the qualities which a minister had to possess (Maula saadvajajama saciramalamatih stastrvid-dristakamma vaga daksh pragalbha karituraga-ratharohabhijahh krtastrah/ Mantra gudho' nuraga prabhrtigunayutaска .... mantrimukhyasya cakre//.- Mau Record, V. 41). Different 'tests' were applied to ascertain the qualities of candidates before their appointment as ministers (pariksha cakre - ibid., V. 21). The Chief Minister was designated 'Mantrimukhya'. The essential qualifications for this high post are mentioned in inscriptions. They were to be 'Sarvopadaudhi' (Mau Record, V. 21), i.e., successful in all the requisite tests to which they were put. (Reference may in this connection be made to Kautilya's theory of 'upadhā' or allures to test the character of ministers (Kautilya's Arthasastra, Book. I., Chap. X). The ministers should be ('nayaprayoge gahane sudaksah') highly expert in the abstruse conduct of politics, endowed with understanding, uprightness (Yuktascet saajo gunairabhijana prajna - Mau Record, V. 31), and similar other qualities, as well as experienced in the working of the different administrative departments. Ananta, who, it is said, 'counselled the very heart of the king' (Mantri mantradhikare sumahati hrdayaa gudha visrambha krtye nityam... Kirtivarmmaevaramasa - ibid., V. 30), and therefore occupied a position like that of a Privy Councillor, had earlier worked as the captain of horses.

and elephants (hastyaśvanetā), the superintendent of the forces of the town (purabalādhyakṣa) and ‘protector of properties’ (ekasvagoptā). His son, Gadādhara having successfully combed the state of the seditious and subversive elements (kṛtvā kaṇṭaka-sodhanam — ibid., V. 39), and having efficiently managed the departments of Kośa (Finance) and Danda (Law and Order) of the realm, was appointed a Pratihāra by king Jayawarnam (ibid., V. 40); and later for his knowledge and practical experience he was made the ‘mantrimukhya’ by Prthvīvarman (ibid., V. 41), in which capacity he continued during the reign of his successor Madanawarnam.

There is a vagueness in the use of the terms, mantri, saciva and amātya. It is consequently difficult to say whether these terms indicated functional or other differences. Along with these terms are also mentioned the expressions, mantrimukhya (Mau Record, V. 41), saciva-mukhya (Bāṭēśvara Record, V. 28) and amātyya-mantrindra (Deogarh Record, V. 5). The mantrimukhya was the chief of mantrins or ministers. Similarly the sacivas had a principal, and the amātyyas, who were either identical with or different from the mantrins, had a chief of their own. It is not unlikely that all these expressions applied to the chief of ministers. There must have been therefore a council of ministers, headed by the Mantrimukhya. Evidently he was the most important official in the state, almost next to the king, and for his experience and knowledge he must have exercised considerable influence over the king. The available Candella records provide names of some chief ministers in different periods, viz., Prabhāsa during the reigns of Jánga and Udaygariṣṭ (Mau Record, V. 20-21)
Vatsaraja of the time of Kirtivarman (Deogarh Record, V. 5), Gadadhara of Prthivivarman and Madanavarman (Mau - V. 41-42), Lānaḍa also of Madanavarman (Bāṭesvar - V. 19-20), Sallakaṇa and Purusottama of Paramardi (ibid., V. 22-24, 27-28).

Some of the ministers counselled the king in secret and confidential matters. Ananta, to whom we have already referred, is described in V. 30 of the Mau Record as 'Mantrī- mantrādhipīraśvā yuta hṛdayam gūḍha viśrāmbha kṛtyaṁyām'. This shows that he was the foremost adviser of the king, and enjoyed his complete confidence in all secret matters of policy. Thus it appears that the policy of the king must have been largely formulated with the help of this minister, who was in all probability the highest authority of the Political department (mantrādhipīraśvā).

In some epigraphic passages, e.g., in the Mau and the Bāṭesvar records, the importance of the chief minister's portfolio is so vividly painted that it may not be wrong to suppose that sometimes he was the power behind the throne, the king almost looking like a puppet in his hands. The policy of Prabhāsa, the chief minister of Dhaṅga and Ganda, was so effective that it became 'trīvarga-phalapradā' (Mau - V. 22) i.e., Dharma, Artha and Kāma. His grandson, Śivanāga, by his efforts claims to have rendered all rulers tributaries to his master, Vidyādhara (ibid., V. 24). Verse 31 of the Mau Stone inscription, referring to Ananta, Kirtivarman's Privy Councillor, records that it is no wonder for the king to surpass even the son of Dharma by his fame, good acts and prosperity, whom the king has for his guide a minister of the calibre of Ananta. Gadadhara, his son, was also highly
eulogised for elevating the status of the Candella kings, Prthvívarman and Madanavarman by the proper application of the six diplomatic expedients (ibid., V. 42), which are also enunciated by Kaútilya, viz., Sudgumyam. Paramardi it is said in the Bāsāvar inscription, placed the whole burden of government on the arms of his chief minister, Sallakṣëna.

If the glories of the ministerial families, as claimed in their own records, are taken to be real, the claims of the Candella kings will fade into insignificance. It will not be safe to regard the accounts given in the records of the ministers as free from exaggerations, nor will it be prudent to deny the vital role which some of the able ministers played, relying on the fulsome praises bestowed upon the kings in their own documents.

Ministers are not known to have been representatives of the people, but they were selected by the king on the basis of merit and other considerations. Therefore, constitutionally, they held their offices at the pleasure of the king. There is, however, no case of removal of a minister on record.

There must have been a regular secretariat or ministerial establishment, 'mantrādikāra', under the Chief minister; other ministers, acting under his guidance, were entrusted with different duties. Of the multifarious activities of the ministers, counselling the king on matters of policy, i.e., foreign affairs, was among the principal duties performed by the chief minister. For example, Gadádhara, already referred to claims to have reduced all princes to dependency by

applying the six expedients, viz., peace, war, marching, sitting encamped, dividing his forces, and alliances with more powerful kings, and so forth, according as the exigencies demanded (Sādgunyaih prayogaih samaya samucitaih prahyabhavam narendrannitva sarvam. Kramanavyatanuta vasudhaisvaryam ekātapatram - Māu Record, V. 42).

Only on one occasion the post of 'Samdhānavigraha mahāsaciva* (Minister of Peace and War) has been mentioned**. This office was held by Gadādhara during the reign of Parmardi. Thus the portfolios of war and peace were under his charge. It may not be unlikely that Gadādhara of this Record and Gadādhara of the Māu Record, who had been found functioning as the Chief minister during the reigns of Prthvīvarman and Madanavarman, were identical. Śivanāga, of the time of Vidyādhara, though not explicitly mentioned as a minister of peace and war, performed the functions appropriate to this office, as he is said to have rendered other rulers tributaries to his master (Māu - V. 24). Vatsarāja, the 'maṭyan- mantrindre' of Vidyādhara, is also stated in V. 6 of the Deogadh Inscription to have indeed become famous, a very Vācaspati in his unique office of the counsellor, having quickly subdued enemies on all sides by his counsel and excellent valour. A casual mention of 'Sādhāhvigrāhika' is found in the Dhuroṭi Copper Plate.".

Suppression of internal enemies and maintenance of law and order within the state were among the functions assigned...
to the chief minister and his department. Thus Sallakṣāṇa the chief minister, is described in V. 24 of the Batesvar record to have succeeded in bringing the 'seditious people' to book (durādhaḥ kṛta kaṇṭakasya). This particular work may not have always been carried out personally by the chief minister, but was delegated to a minister enjoying his confidence or a trusted official. Thus the Māu Record refers to Gadādhara, a son of Ananta, performing the duties relating to 'kantakaśodhana' (weeding out of thorns) during the reign of Sallakṣāṇavarmāṇ, when his father held the office of the chief minister in the kingdom (V. 39). Ajaygadh Rock Insc. of the time of Ehojavarmāṇ mentions one Alhu of the Vāstavya Kāya family, who was engaged in the administration of the city gates and thoroughfare (pratoli-adhikāra) in keeping down wickedness (V. 13).

The Pratihāra seems to have enjoyed the rank and designation of a saciva. The Pratihāra was not a mere doorkeeper to usher in those who come to meet the king. He was the chief of the royal bodyguards and master of ceremonies. His official duties required him to keep close to the king's person. As the king's security was much dependent on his services, he was careful about the choice of his Pratihāra. This is evident from V. 40 of the Māu record, which states, 'sastarincmiti sa Jayavarmavānāndrāna yatnatamaṣṭau pratihitamahimā Pratihārye niyuktah' (King Jayavarman eagerly appointed him, i.e., Gadādhara, the chastiser of enemies and famous for his greatness, near his own person, in the office of Pratihāra). It is quite probable that before his appointment as Pratihāra, Gadādhara must have shown his ability by
his work relating to 'kantakaśodhana'. The King seems to have flourished with the loyal support of this influential family, as is evident from the fact that Gadadhara's father, Ananta, was the chief minister, while he served as a 'saciva' and 'pratihāra'. Verse 10 of the Ajaygadh Rock Inscription of Bhojavaran shows that Gaṅgādhara, a favourite councillor (sacivobhirāma) of the Vāstavya kāyastha family was appointed kaṅcukī (chamberlain by Paramardi after due consideration.

His younger brother, Jaunsdhara, who was a valiant warrior himself, assisted Gaṅgādhara in his work (sahakarmacāri' V.11).

Among other sacivas was the Treasurer, Śubhata, a saciva was in charge of Treasury establishments (kośādhikārādhipati). Gadadhara, another saciva, whom we have already mentioned as a Pratihāra, for some time held the portfolios of kośa and danda (kośaya dandaśaya ca - Maț Record, V. 39). The function of the saciva in charge of kośa may have been wide enough to include duties relating to supervision over collection of revenue, as well as its expenditure. 'Bhandagarapati', the superintendent of royal stores is mentioned only in one occasion.

Two other ministers are mentioned in epigraphic records with no indication of the functions assigned to them. One of them was Gaṇapati, a minister of Viravarman (Ajaygadh Rock inscription of 1281 A.D.), and the other was Nāna under

62. In rendering the verse to English, Kielhorn gives the name as Gadadhara, though in the text it was mentioned as Gaṅgādhara. The facsimile of the record in Pl. XIV., A.S.R., XXI., L. 5, also shows it as 'Gaṅgādhara'.
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We may now consider the organisation of the judicial department in the Candella kingdom. The Khajurāho record of V.S. 1059 refers to Bhaṭṭa Yaśodhara, a royal priest, placed in charge of the Judiciary, the department of Dharma, Dharmādhikāra, by Candeśa Dhanāga. Next to the king, who must have usually represented the highest tribunal, this royal chaplain, in charge of Dharma, must have been the highest authority in judicial matters including the interpretation of law as embodied in the Sārtis and their Commentaries.

In this connection we may refer to another term, 'Dharmalekhi', mentioned in the Sārā and Nānyaua 'C' Plates. This has been taken to mean a writer of legal documents. Evidently Prthvīdharā of the Vāsturya race, who composed the long and complex document, revalidating some former grants of lands was a technical expert in drafting legal documents (Dharmalekhi). The composer of the Chārkharī Plate (V.S.1236), Subhānda has also been described as Dharmalekhi (I.I., XX, p. 431). The expression 'Arthalekhi' has been used in the Dhureśi Copper Plate (ibid., XXV), evidently to denote the same function. The work done by them was probably similar to that usually performed by a pleader or a solicitor in modern times.

Lastly we may refer to the high officials of the Secretariat (māṇya adhikrātan). They are mentioned in different Candella records variously as Kāyasthas, Karanikas, Adhikrātan and Lekhakas. Although different designations are mentioned in

different records, it is likely that their functions were identical. The Kayasthas thus held a prominent place, as is shown from their frequent mention in the land grants of the Candellas. We have already referred to the Vāstavya Kayastha family to which Gaṅgādhara and Subhāta belonged. Kayasthas are also mentioned in connection with the drafting of legal documents, and they figure as a class to whom grants are communicated. Aṣapaṭalika (keeper of accounts) is mentioned in the Chārkārī Plate, though in connection with the drafting of the record.7

A rock inscription of the time of Bhojavaman mentions a family of Vāstavya Kayasthas, who hereditarily held high and responsible offices under successive Gandella rulers.7 Thakkura Jājuka of this family, who was appointed by king Gandā to superintend all the affairs of the state (Sarvādhikāra-karaṇesu sadā-niyuktah), received the gift of a village, named Dugandā, from the king (V. 7). To another member of this family, Vīdana, the king is stated to have entrusted the responsibility of the realm (vinyasta-rājyam – V. 15). Two other members of this family received the unique decoration of Viṣīṣa accompanied by grants of lands. Maheśvara, the son of Jājuka was made the Viṣīṣa of Kālañjara, and was awarded the village, named Pipalāhika, by king Kirtivarman (V. 9). Vāsa or Vāsaka was also appointed the Viṣīṣa of
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Jayadurga or Ajaygadh (durge Jayākhyē viśiṣādhihāre) along with the grant of the village of Varbhavari by king Trailokya-varman (V. 17). Viśiṣa is rather an unusual designation, not met with in any other record. In all probability it refers to an administrative post associated with a fort. Alternatively, the term Viśiṣa may have been used as a title conferred on officials in recognition of their meritorious services, which seem to have been accompanied with a gift of land.

The inscription also refers to the traditional theory relating to the sanctity of '36 towns', famous for the settlement of the Kayasthas. Thus it appears that the Kayasthas enjoyed an honourable status in the Candella court.

The royal court was adorned by one or more official poets. The Kavi was generally a Brāhmaṇa, who was honoured for his knowledge and literary gifts. Most of the inscriptions were composed by these kavis. Vaidya (the official Physician), Āṭākka (forest officer) and Dūta (messenger, who communicated royal orders and grants) also enjoyed a place of prominence among the officers of the Candella state.

Military Department. - That the Army under the Candellas was administered efficiently cannot be denied, for the growth of the Candella kingdom itself was an unmistakable proof of
the strength of the army and superiority of its organisation. The supreme leader of the army was the king himself. He often led the army personally in military campaigns. The minister in charge of war and peace (Sañdhānavigrha-mahāsacīva or Sañdhivigraha) was evidently the political adviser to the king in military matters relating to the declaration of war and the settlement of terms of peace.

The army had its Commander in chief designated as Senapati,73 who must have led the forces in the battle-field. Besides, there were special officers in charge of elephants and cavalry, hastyāśvanetā.74 The defensive organisation was also looked after by specially appointed officers. The Purabalādhayaksa was the Superintendent of the forces defending the capital city. Koṭṭapāla, referred to in the Bhumati Copper Plate, may be regarded as in charge of defence of small towns. The office of the Ekasvagoptā also appears to have been a military one. His duty was to protect properties, i.e., buildings etc., under the control of the army. It may be noted that the functions of the Purabalādhayaksa and the Ekasvagoptā are found to have been combined and entrusted to the same officer. The forts must have had a governor (durgādhipa). Pāmśuha, son of Śri Ayo is mentioned to have been appointed as a governor of Jayadurgga along with its approach roads (pratolikānvita Jayapura-durgādhipa).75 The office of the governor of the fort was called durgādhi-kāra.

73. (Senāpati Madanapālaśeaman - Icchāwār Plate., I.A., XXIV., P. 205.
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Ananda, the younger brother of Yaseka, the Viśisa of Jayapura, is stated to have been made the governor of the fort by the king. The Aśvavaidyya or the Veterinary Surgeon, mentioned in the Candella record, must have been attached to the army. Even Kāyasthas and Brāhmaṇas were entrusted with responsible military functions. Jamādhara and Malādhara, younger brothers of Gāndādhara, belonged to the Vāstavya Kāyastha family, which, as already mentioned, produced illustrious administrators. Both the brothers have been described as distinguished warriors (vīra-mukhya). The Pachār Plate refers to Senāpati Madanapālasarman, evidently a Brāhmaṇa. In recognition of meritorious military services grants of land were used to be made in their favour. Madanapālasarman received the grant of a village, as recorded in the Pachār Plate of the time of Paramardi. The Dehi Grant refers to one Mallaya sa a distinguished soldier being similarly rewarded. The Chārkhāri Plate of Vīravarman records the grant of a village to one Rāuta Abhi for a deed of valour in the battle of Sondhi (Sondhimigrāma ... kṛta-virātiśaye prasāde). There was also the system of granting pension, 'Mrtyukavrtti', to heirs of persons killed in battle. The Garrā Plates of V.S. 1261 (1205-1206 A.D.) record grants of lands to Rāuta Šāmanta, son of Rāuta Pāpe, who was killed at Kakaḍadeha in a battle with
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the Turuskas (Kakadadahu Turuska-yuddhe mṛta Rā. Pāpe putrasya Rā. Saṁanta nāme prasādana mṛtyukavṛttau sāsanem kṛtvā pradattāti/).

Administrative Divisions.—The Candella kingdom, generally known as Jejābhukti or Jejakabhukti, was for administrative reasons divided into a number of districts, subdivisions and village-groups. The village must have been the unit of administration. Some villages were organised into unions—thus there were village-groups, comprising of 5, 12, or 16 villages, viz., Pilikhinipancela and Itāvapaṅcèla in Dādāhi, and Isarāhara-pancela in Vadavārī; Khāṭau-dvādaśaka, Rāḥasatkaṭa-Taṇṭa-dvādaśaka and Hāṭaṭādaśaka in Vikāura Viṣaya (Saurā Plate).

Rewā Copper plate grants of the Mahārāṇakas of Kakaradikā mention an expression, ‘Pattala’, denoting a territorial unit larger than a village, as the villages, Hehi and Agaseyi are stated to have been included in the Vaddharapattala and the village, Ahāḍapāda in the Khaṇḍagaha pattala. Dhureti Copper Plates refer to Dhovahatta pattana situated in Bhanavahi-pattalā. Pattala might have denoted a type of village-group. Names of the following villages are met with in the available Candella records. —Yullī, Durvāharā, Bāmharā, Ramāsū, Rāmāsau Kāmanauda, Vįjauligrama, Śaṣeigrama, Ulaḍāna, Dādāhi, Navasahatthidahā, Patha, Vādavārī, Nandī, Dhanaurā, Kadoha, Lohneihani, Kakaradeha, Rehi, Agasεyi, Doddu, Lavā, Dugandā, Pipalehi, Varbhavari, Bhūtappaliṇī Kumbhiṭibhaṭa-grama, Tuṭṭumgraṭa, Kokaḍa(or, Kikaḍa) graṇa, Suganda and Ahāḍapāda. Most of them are however unidentifiable.

80. 2/1., P. 272.
We do not find sufficient details about the system of village administration under the Candellas. Royal grants were communicated among others to Brāhmaṇas, Kūtambins (householders) and Mahattaras (village-headmen or dignitaries). They were possibly associated with the village administration. It is not however clear whether these Mahattaras were royal dignitaries entrusted with local administration. The Mahattama is mentioned in the Nānyaura Plate 'B' of V.S. 1107. He had a larger jurisdiction than the Mahattara, as he is mentioned in the record to be associated with the 'janapada' ("Mahattama-janapada").

The next larger unit was 'avasthā' or subdivision, e.g., 'Rājapura-avasthāyām Raṇamana-samvaddhān Kathāhaugrāme' (Nānyaura Plate 'B'), Kathahau village, attached to Raṇamana, included in the Rājapura avasthā. Another expression which seems to be almost synonymous is 'pratibaddham' as it also stands for a subdivision, e.g., 'Usarvāha pratibaddham ... Yullināmadhoyagrāmā' (Nānyaura Plate 'A').

The term Viṣaya signified a definitely larger administrative area. A number of visayas are mentioned in the Candella inscriptions, viz., Sudāli visaya (near Philsā), Vikauraviṣaya (Madanpur), Dudāhi visaya (Lalitpur), Vedavāri visaya(Berwārā) Lalitpur, Mandāvana visaya (Banda district), Brācha visaya (Hamirpur), Pāniuli visaya (Fāmna), Vikrami viṣaya (Vikaura in Saugor district) Karigāva visaya, (Jhansi), Kirayida visaya (near Mahobā), Dāhīviṣaya Vedesaitha visaya, Antarvedi viṣaya (Ganges-Jumna Doab) and Pitaśaila visaya (unidentified).

Mandala and Viṣaya denoted the same sense, as we find in the Chārkhaṇi Plate of V.S. 1108, that the village named

\[\text{Vide ante. Chap. 2, p. 15. An explanation of the term has been suggested.}\]
Bhūtapallika is situated in the Navarāstra-mandala which is described as a visaya.

The term 'Bhuktī' is not known to have been used by the Candellas in the sense of an administrative division larger than a visaya. Their kingdom itself was known as 'Jajkabhukti'. Bhattachārahāra villages or those which had been granted rent-free to Brāhmaṇas often find mention in the Candella records, e.g., Dhakāri, Namgāva, Phandiva, Mutānasa and Mutatha. Some of the cities and towns, and places important for royal encampments as known from the Candella records may be mentioned here, though all of them are not identifiable. Viz., Tarkkarikā, Suhavāsa-samāvāsa, Bhaila-svāmi-samipāvāsa (mod. Bhilsā), Kharjuravāhaka (Khajurāho), Remāripura, Madāripura, Sonasāra-samāvāsa, Vāridurgā (probably Dārigār), Gahilu, Vīlāsa-pura (probably Pachār), Vadavāḍa, Jayapura or Nandipura (Ajaygadh), Kāḍikā (Kāśi), Kakaraḍikā (Kakrēri), Padmāvati (Norwar), Dhovasatapattana Kirttigiridurgā (Deogadh), Gopagiri (Gwalior), Kakadadaha (mod. Kukuroca), Kāḷānjara and Sondhi (Sonadā fort now called, Kānhār-garh).

Revenue - Administration. - Sufficient importance was attached to the administration of kośa (treasury), as is evident from the fact that it was placed under the charge of a minister, or even the Chief Minister, as seems to be likely from the evidence already mentioned. The kośa was believed to be one of the integral constituents of the state.

Land must have been one of the chief sources of the revenue collected by the Candellas. The rate of the land tax is not explicitly mentioned in their records, but it was
customary in many places to raise this tax at the rate of 1/6th of the produce of the soil. Increased rates were also current; variations of rates sometimes were due to the quality of the cultivated land and abnormal financial or political situation. The list of revenue terms found in the records comprise, Bhāga, Bhoga, Kara, Paśu, Hiranya, Dandadaya, Chāṭādipravēda and Šulka.

The expression 'Bhāgabhогādikām' probably means the king's customary grain-share, assessed on the produce of the fields, and realised in kind, as distinguished from 'hiranya', realised in cash on certain special kinds of crops. Bhāgabhогādikām may be identical to an almost similar expression 'Bhāgabhогakara'. But Bhāga, bhoga and kara may be considered separately also. Bhāga was the traditional 1/6th share of the crop due to the king, which may be altered, as stated in the legal texts. Bhoga, as Dr. Ghosal holds, stands for the periodical supplies of fruits, firewood, flowers and the like, which the villagers had to furnish to the king. It may indicate the state's share of the profits (bhoga) derived from the possession of the particular land, which are stated to be eight in number, e.g., Nidhi (treasure-trove), Nikṣapa (underground deposits), Pāśaṇa (stones), Siddha (land already under cultivation), Sādhyā (cultivable waste land), Jula (water), Akṣiṇī (present profits) and Āgāmi (future profits). Of these Nidhi, Nikṣapa and Pāśaṇa are specifically mentioned in the Chārkharī Plate of V.S. 1346. Kara has been differently
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intercepted by different scholars. According to their views it was, - (i) a periodical tax over and above the king's grain share, (ii) an emergency tax in addition to the grain share and, or (iii) a tax upon merchant's profits.

Hiranya was probably a cash levy on some special kinds of crops, the customary grain share being levied on ordinary crops. It may also mean certain cash impost over and above the normal bhāga. Paśu is a revenue term, denoting a tax on cattle but is often used in epigraphic documents along with the term, hiranya in a rather conventional way.

Dandādāya was receipts from court fines and punishments. Šulka must have denoted taxes and duties on merchandise, realised from traders. The expression 'omāṣadipraveśa' (entry by irregular soldiers and others) mentioned in some of the Candella land grants may indicate the expenses paid by villagers for the maintenance of irregular troops, if and when, they were posted in the localities, either for the maintenance of internal peace or to meet any other emergency.

It appears from the evidence discussed above that the source of revenue exploited in the Candella kingdom were identical with those known in many other parts of contemporary India. No new revenue term is to be met with in the Candella records.

Different types of land may be discovered in the words, - sāra, usara, nimna, unnata, sthāvara, jāngama, jala sthala, gartta and pāṣāna, used in the Candella land grants. It is probable that such classification was necessary for an accurate assessment of royal dues. These terms are also found in contemporary records of other dynasties. It is evident therefore that the Candellas did not introduce any novel feature in the fiscal arrangement of land.
Detailed boundaries of land, as furnished in the available grants, testify to the importance assigned to accurate measurements. The Mahobā Plate of Paramardideva describes a piece of land granted in the village of Dhamaura, as 'bounded on the east by the nāla belonging to the barber, on the south by a nāla, on the west by the embankment of Bhatahaha tank, on the north by a brahmin's land and tank-embankment'. Similarly the Augasī Plates mention 'an ant-hill by a madhuka tree' as the western boundary of a gift land. The villages were well known, "prakhyāta catuh sima paryantaṁ". Boundary pillars or 'grāmādandakas' are mentioned in the Augasī Grant. The Chārkharī Plate (V.S. 1108) refers to 'simātrnakaśṭhaka' of the village Bhutapallikā.

Land was measured on the basis of its sowing or ploughing capacity. The Augasī Grant records the grant of 'ten ploughs of land' (hala-daśa ankopi hala 10) of the village Vaaharaḍā in the Sudāli viṣaya to the brahmin Rahulaśrman. Similarly the Chārkharī grant mentions a gift of five ploughs of land (pancahalani). The Saurā Plates while recording a long list of land gifts excludes a plot of land measuring four ploughs (halacatustayavacchinnah). The sowing capacity as a possible unit of measurement is mentioned in the Pachār Plate, where it is said that a 'prastha' of seeds was to be sown in each 'vādha' of land. But the total land donated was mentioned
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in terms of hala, i.e., da^ahalavacchinnabhumih, ten ploughs of land to be shown with 7 ½ dronas of seed. The term Vādha is also mentioned in the Mahobā Plate, land being donated being 60 square vādhas (dairghye vādha 10 vistare vādha 6 jātavādha saṣṭhyānvita) equivalent to five hales. The evidences mentioned above point out the importance of hala or the ploughing capacity as the popular unit of measurement of cultivable plots of land in the Gandella state. Land for the dwelling place is found to be measured in terms of 'hasta' (cubits). A plot of land measuring 52 square cubits for dwelling purposes is recorded to have been given to a brahmin in the Mahobā plate. The Semrā Plates refer to the (Pada' measurement, plots measuring padadvayaḥ, padamekam, padārddham, padacaturdham, padaśat-ankatopī pada 6, padacatvarimsad-ankatopī pada 43 were donated to brahmins. The rate of this measurement is however not indicated in the records.

Exemptions from payments of land-revenue and other taxes were sometimes granted to Brahmin teachers and scholars. Brahmadeya villages or lands with immunity from taxes, given to such brahmins probably constituted the Bhaṭṭāgrahāras. The deed of gift in such a case not only fully states the terms of immunity but also in the conventional style the condition of perpetual enjoyment conferred on the grantee (candrārkā samakālaṁ putrapautrānvaṃ vāminyeś) with complete proprietary rights (karṣataṁ karṣayatam dānaḥhāna vikrayam vā kurvātām na kaccid kācid vādha karttavyā - Semrā Plates).
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That these were not merely conventional statements is evident from the fact recorded in the Dherati Copper Plates that a village had been mortgaged (vittabandha) by a Saivite religious institution. The mortgagee was given all the rights of collecting taxes. As suggested by Dr. N.P. Chakravarti, the village was to be held by the mortgagee as a pledge as long as he wished, probably meaning thereby, till all the dues were cleared. Bhattacharhara villages are often mentioned in the Chandella records, evidently those rent-free villages granted to brahmans.

Besides Brahmadeya Chandella grants refer to land given in lieu of salary for official duties, or as a reward for any meritorious service rendered either in the civil or military capacity. The most interesting type of land grants mentioned in two of the Chandella records, known as the Garra plates, is 'Mrtyuka-vratti'. This term is found applied to a grant made to the heir of a valiant soldier who laid down his life in a battle against the Turuskas.
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